

A PLEA FOR THE SLAVE.

ADDRESSED TO ALL

PROFESSING CHRISTIANS IN AMERICA.

READER, will you permit me to plead with you for a few moments in behalf of two MILLIONS of slaves? They are of the same blood with you, they breathe with you the air of the same Christian America, they are invited by the same crucified Saviour to a place in his bosom and his heaven, they are hastening to the same judgment bar to receive with you the retributions of eternity. They are in every important sense your *brethren*. Yet they are bought and sold and possessed by irresponsible masters as if they were *beasts*. By the very necessity of their condition they are deprived of all those influences which tend to elevate man as a moral being. They are divested of all ennobling responsibilities. The American slave can call nothing his *own*; neither house nor land, wife nor children, body nor limbs, nor even his very soul, for that must direct his muscles at the bidding of another. If he enjoys any of these things by the sufferance of his master, it is but a mockery. The sword hangs over him, by a thread, which may sunder his very heart strings at any moment. To-day, under a mildly administered despotism, he may be surrounded by a family that might make him happy, but for the ever present thought, that to-morrow he may see his wife and babes under the hammer of the brutal auctioneer. The law under which he is held knows no mercy. Its inexorable mandate makes him a mere "chattel," and for the safety of that "species of property," it denies him the knowledge of letters, the Bible, and the privilege of worshipping God when and where he pleases. The law withholds its protection from his person by refusing to hear the testimony

of any black man in the case of any white one. In some States it even expressly sanctions all possible cruelty by granting to the masters impunity when they KILL "by *moderate correction!*" It is in vain to say that in their general actual practice the slaveholders do not go to the extent of these iniquitous laws. The laws in any State are a good index of the popular will. If a majority of the masters were mild and humane they would not have published their own shame on the pages of their own statute books. In human despotism cruelty of practice is always wont to go beyond cruelty of law. If we do not believe this in regard to the slaves, it must be because we have received the testimony of the masters only. But if we will carefully examine even the testimony of the masters, we shall find that the whole system is one of unchecked CRUELTY, LUST, and BLOOD. But I will not insult your understanding by attempting to prove, by holding up its atrocities in detail, the wickedness of a system which sets out by making transferable property of the *human body and soul!*

Now, how comes it, that the worst system of slavery the world ever saw, exists in the NINETEENTH CENTURY, in REPUBLICAN AMERICA, a land full of BIBLES and the strong hold of REFORMED CHRISTIANITY?

Let me assign one or two reasons, and show how they affect *your* moral obligations.

I. THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH HAS MADE A COMPROMISE WITH THIS SIN. She has broken up the very foundation of Christian morals in favor of slaveholding! She has given the cruel system all needful support!

Be not startled, Christian reader, but look at the proof. God has said, THOU SHALT NOT STEAL! He who retains in involuntary servitude a fellow man, *as property*, takes without the owner's consent not only the products of his industry, but the very producer. He steals, not merely what a man possesses, but all of which he consists. He is therefore guilty of consummate theft. Yet the Christian Church receives him to her fellowship. This she has done till a very large part of her members are slaveholders. In this state of things, what can you do for the victim of oppression? The moment you declare the tenure by which he is held to be *fraud*, it is exclaimed,

“You denounce good men!” “How can slaveholding be essentially wrong while so many *Christians* are slaveholders?” Thus these Christian slaveholders, these *brethren of the Church* are held up as a shield behind which the whole system of tyranny is safe. Reader, would you hesitate for a moment to call slaveholding *fraud, oppression, man-stealing*, if none were involved in it but notoriously wicked men? No, this you grant by acknowledging that slavery is wrong in the *abstract*. You never extenuate by apologies the guilt of the abandoned profligate. Then this very fact that so many otherwise good Church members are slaveholders presents to your mind the strongest argument in favor of the system. And by thus warding off from it the blows of truth, these “good men” do more to perpetuate the sin, than if they were bad. They throw all their sanctity on the side of Satan! Thus has the Church, by receiving slaveholders to her bosom, given her whole weight to that philosophy which legislates for God, and makes its own view of “*expediency*” the basis of virtue—a doctrine which can sanctify any system of sin. *Thus has she thrust MEN into the place of God.*

“But, after all, are not *many slaveholders* really *good men*? and do they not really think it their *duty* to hold slaves?” Whether they are really *good men* or not, is not for us to decide, but for Him who will not fail to decide it according to truth at the Judgment Day. But that their slaveholding is no part of their goodness we certainly can decide. For their *thinking* it to be their duty to hold slaves, no more makes it so, than did Paul’s thinking he ought to persecute the Church. make it his duty to drag men and women to slaughter. We are left therefore to decide on the *conduct* by the law of God, and if by that law there is any such thing as stealing, then slaveholding is the highest kind of theft. Whether such a thief, or any other, may not, “after all,” be a *good man*, is not the question for us to decide, but we must decide that he *is* a *thief*, a *man-stealer*, and treat him accordingly.

Again, it is said, slaveholding cannot be *always* wrong, for the Holy Scriptures recognize the right of the master when they enjoin obedience upon the servant. Do the Scriptures recognize the right of *all* “the powers that be” when they enjoin obedience to them? Do they recognize

the right of the smiter when they require to turn the other cheek? Christianity enjoins sufferance of *wrong*, patience under *injuries*, for the sake of the Gospel.

In regard to a multitude of wicked customs the Scriptures say nothing expressly. They lay down general principles or rules which conscience is to apply to specific cases. They make every man responsible for his example. Now if there exists a system of slavery, which, by making property of them, subjects the great mass of its victims to the greatest possible injury, then does the Gospel forbid all participation in that system. Even those who treat their slaves the most kindly uphold the system by their *example*. They prevent even non-slaveholders from reprobating it in unqualified terms, how much more then do they quiet the consciences of their fellow slaveholders. We may apply to the *kind slaveholder* the language of the Saviour, "Wo to that man by whom the offence cometh. It were better that a millstone were hanged about his neck, and he cast into the depth of the sea."

But let the *Christian* slaveholder remember that the Gospel condemns his practice not merely on the ground of *example*. With God there is no respect of persons. *He* has said, the laborer is worthy of his *hire*. *He* has said that in Christ Jesus there is neither bond nor free. How can this be if one *Christian* can hold another as *property*? Think you that the slaveholders who were converted on the day of Pentecost still regarded their slaves as property? If so, then they sold their brethren, who had perhaps been converted under the same sermon, and laid down the *price* of *bones* and *sinews*, and *souls* too, at the apostles' feet. No, the man who should have offered this insult to the Holy Ghost then, would have been buried with Annanias and Sapphira. It has been left for *Christians* of these days to profane the treasury of the Lord with the price of blood! And it may be, that not a few of them owe their lives to the cessation of miracles.

Here then is one of the reasons why one sixth part of our population are slaves. Christians have made such a compromise with sin that the horrible system does not stand out before the world in its true light—they have

even perverted the book of God by drawing from it the defence of slavery,—thus preaching tyranny from the charter of the world's liberty.

II. TWO MILLIONS OF PERSONS ARE SLAVES IN THIS CHRISTIAN LAND BECAUSE THERE IS A CRUEL PREJUDICE AGAINST THEIR COLOR. A single fact furnishes ample proof of the existence of such a prejudice. A Society has arisen within the last seventeen years, embracing the most distinguished men of every denomination, which proposes to remove the entire colored population across the Atlantic; assigning as a principal reason that there is a *prejudice* against them which will forever prevent their rising here. How strong this prejudice is, may be judged from the fact that the place preferred to the United States for elevating the condition of the colored people is a spot on the coast of Africa—a heathen land, which by the long practice of the slave trade is polluted with every influence unfavorable to Christianity. To say nothing of its tropical climate, it is one of the most difficult missionary fields on the globe. How bitter and cruel must be that prejudice which can thus counteract all our boasts of freedom and humanity, and make these United States worse than the darkest habitation of cruelty for the purpose of restoring liberty and communicating equality to the victims of our own oppression! Is this prejudice confined to one particular set of men? Are those, who are so generously offering to carry the colored people beyond its reach, themselves free from it? If they are, they have influence enough to overcome it here. Let *them* but plead the cause of the poor slave, with a consistent *example*, and this prejudice will vanish like the mists of the morning.

This foolish prejudice against color, prevents our sympathy with the slave. It prevents us from welcoming those escaped from cruel bondage and cheering them on in a course of honest industry. It prevents us from imparting to the *natural friend* of the slave that education which would give him an incalculable moral influence against the system. Let the free colored men of the North be well educated, let them number among themselves men of the highest moral worth and intellectual strength, and slavery would totter to its downfall.

Now if it be true that these two causes do fortify the system of slavery, can it ever be removed till an entire moral reformation has taken place? Does not the cause of the oppressed cry aloud that every man, woman, and child should think and speak and act on the principle that man *can have no right of property in man*?—that slaveholding is the worst kind of robbery? Must not all welcome the truth, that “God has made of one blood all nations;” and that distinction of color has no right to sever the bonds of Christian brotherhood, and that, therefore, black and white ought to dwell together as good friends, neighbors, and fellow citizens? Ought we not to throw all the disgrace of oppression, not on the oppressed, but on the unrelenting oppressor? Yes; had the professed followers of Christ in this land always done so, there would not now be in this vast house of bondage TWO MILLIONS of groaning slaves;—they must do so before these slaves can be free. Here, reader, is your responsibility; your influence is needed; your prayers are needed.

“But no slave labors for me. Why come to me, with this appeal?” If this be true, I rejoice to hear it. It shows that you are careful not to consume the products of slave labor, and that you do not in any way justify or palliate the crime. But more than this is required. If your own mother’s son were smarting beneath the lash of an “overseer,” a mere chattel, would you not reprobate the crime of holding him? Would you not often speak of his case to your neighbors? Would you not arouse sympathy in his behalf far and near? You would not set down, would you, and say, “Nothing can be done; if I meddle with this subject I shall exasperate the planters and dissolve the Union?” No. Nor would you sympathize with the planter and believe him when he said that he would liberate as soon as it could be done *safely*, and that he wished for the liberation of your brother as much as you yourself could! No, you would cry aloud without sparing, you would call mightily upon God and give the oppressor no rest till he had liberated your brother. And who is the poor, oppressed, down-trodden slave but your brother, by a tie that swallows up all other ties?

But here comes the grand objection : “Bad as slavery is, an immediate emancipation of all the slaves would be still worse, both for the master and the slave. It would break up the whole system of *social order*, and set afloat upon the community an idle and vicious population—a curse to themselves and to the whites.”

As the objector is one who judges of right and wrong by the apprehended consequences of action, let us attend to the consequences of his objection. It is founded on the alleged unfitness of the slaves for liberty under law. They are so ignorant and degraded that the only safe government for them is the worst kind of despotism. This sort of government therefore must be maintained till they are prepared for a better. But the preparation for a better, according to the testimony of the planters themselves, is utterly incompatible with this form of government, and must lead to its violent overthrow. Therefore they are to be kept under despotism because they are too ignorant for freedom, and they are to be kept in ignorance because knowledge is incompatible with despotism. Or, in other words, they are to be held as *property* till they are fit to exercise certain “inalienable” rights, but they must not be fitted to exercise these rights because the first step in the process would teach them that these rights are justly theirs, after which it would be difficult to hold them as *property*. So it appears that rather than give them their rights at once, the slaves are either to be kept in perpetual bondage, or subjected to a course of preparation which will *immediately* excite them to right, themselves !

Again the objector would have the slaves freed, if at all, only so fast as they become prepared to enjoy liberty with benefit to themselves and the community. But who is to be judge of the fitness of the slaves for liberty ? The master of course ; otherwise there would be an invasion of his “right of property.” But how can he judge of this fitness from consequences which he can never *know* till this very judgment has been passed ? Consequently, since he can never *know* that his slaves will be better off than under his own mild sway, for no man thinks himself a tyrant, how can we expect him ever to free them on account of any preparation they may have acquired ?

But let us look again at the objection,—“*immediate* emancipation would be worse than continued slavery.”

Then if a majority of the slaveholders were convinced that slavery ought to be abolished *to-day*, at all hazards,—that their fellow men ought no longer to be considered as *property*, exposed to the hammer of the auctioneer, but as free moral agents, subject to *equitable* law, *they must not abolish it*,—that would be a *fatal mistake*. Slavery is wrong, most wickedly wrong, but you must not persuade slaveholders that they ought to abolish it at once, for it is their duty to continue in the wrong till their victims can enjoy liberty without injury to themselves and the community!

Are there any facts in support of the objection? Has immediate emancipation ever produced evil consequences? We are pointed to the free blacks of the South—they are worse off than the slaves, it is said. Evidently they do not think themselves so; for we never hear of their selling themselves into bondage, which they might easily do. “But they are more indolent and vicious than the slaves.” So are the masters of slaves, as a general fact; are the masters, then, worse off than their own slaves? “But the free blacks are very poor.” Not so poor as the slave, for he owns less than nothing, he is himself a mere piece of property. We can hardly say that *he* is even fed and clothed, for it is not his own body that is fed and clothed, but another man’s! In consistency with the rules of good English, if we admit the *right of property*, we must say of a slave *it* is fed and clothed—an assertion which in point of fact is to a lamentable extent *untrue*.

But for the sake of the argument let us grant that the free blacks at the South are worse off than the slaves. Does liberty make them so? No, surely; it may be proved from the slaveholders’ own lips that they oppress the free blacks for the sake of retaining their slaves the more easily. The objector infers, that if *all* the slaves should be given up at once, they would be no better off than the free blacks are now! Excellent logic!

Facts on the other side are not wanting. FIVE HUNDRED THOUSAND slaves were emancipated at once in St. Domingo, and the act restored peace and tranquillity to the island, which was not disturbed till the whites attempted to re-enslave them. Slavery has been abolished in Mexico, Peru, Colombia, the island of Java, at the Cape of Good Hope, &c. &c. without any evil consequence.

Reader, will you harbor to the injury of TWO MILLIONS of unoffending countrymen, the monstrous doctrine that justice and mercy are less safe and beneficial to all parties than tyranny and oppression? that it is dangerous to let men enjoy their unforfeited, unalienable rights because they happen to be poor and unlettered? If you will, be assured that all tyrants will regard you with brotherly complacency. That the great body of slaves may need some preparation to qualify them to be judges and legislators, or even voters, I do not deny. In this respect let the same rules be applied to them, as are applied to white men in their respective States. Equality is all we contend for. But that they need any preparation to be the free subjects of equitable laws, not as *property*, but as *persons* capable of holding property, I count a most mischievous absurdity, for it is an injurious denial of a "self evident truth."

Some are so much deceived as to suppose slavery only an extension of family government. The slaves, being unable to provide for themselves, say they, stand to their masters in the relation of *children* to *parents*, consequently it would be wrong to turn them off to shift for themselves, or yield to their foolish desire for liberty. Does the institution of family government give a man a right to *sell a child*, whether his own by birth or adoption? Does it give him the right of restraining the child beyond the specified age of majority? Does the institution of family government give the parent the power of preventing the child's having a family of his own? The institution of slavery does. It virtually breaks up *one sixth part* of the families in the United States. Are slaveholders to be sustained in the plea, that because they have a right to the services of their children, apprentices and wards, during minority, on the ground of God's institution, they have therefore a *right of property* in whole families of other people, men, women and children, in perpetuity?

It is in vain to attempt to whitewash this system of sin. Even slaveholders feel it to be so. But immense mischief is done by pleading palliations and excuses, while we admit it to be an enormous wickedness,—by granting that the Scriptures *may* mean to sanction the relation of master and slave, that they do give some color to the slave-

holder's plea. This is all that any slaveholder asks,—it is sufficient to support the system, so far as opinion can do it. We do not allow ourselves to palliate any sin that we are in earnest to remove.

Here this subject swells beyond the importance of the mere abolition of slavery. It is a question of general principles,—a sort of trial question in regard to the conversion of the world. This baleful hatred of the black man must be overcome before *we* can have any part in bringing the world under the influence of the Gospel. The greater part of mankind are *colored*. Do we suppose that the American Church can Christianize the *colored* world while it harbors such a prejudice against the colored people in its own bosom—a prejudice which almost entirely prevents it from making any effort in behalf of *two millions* of slaves? Can it clear the vision of SIX HUNDRED MILLIONS while a beam is in its own eye? Can it sever the chains of Hindoo *caste* while it cherishes caste at home? No, says honesty, this tyrannous *respect of persons*, at war with the precepts of the Gospel, must be abolished *here*, before with clean hands we can bear the vessels of the Lord!

Be not deceived with the scheme of removing *slavery* by transporting the *free*. A physical remedy cannot cure a moral evil. If the whites as a body hate the blacks so that they will not live in the same community with them on terms of *equality*, how can it be expected that white slaveholders, as a body, should give up their slaves any faster than is sufficient to hold the rest in safety. Benevolence, when it can help it, does not thrust its object away from it. Every man who sends a slave into exile, and claims the merit of benevolence for the act, must be able to say, that, so far as he is concerned, the slave might stay here as a free man and be happy. He must charge upon the community around him an *uncontrollable* force of wicked prejudice, to make exile from this land of plenty a blessing. Now, can the whole mass of slaveholders exile their slaves on this plea? If so, what has become of the prejudice? It must be a PUBLIC prejudice in which no INDIVIDUAL participates! An omnipresent *phantom*, at home *nowhere*! Either, then, there is no prejudice which can justify the few who now exile

their slaves, or, it is in vain to expect the entire mass to imitate these few any faster than individual prejudice yields to truth and reason. Now which is the surest way to make this prejudice yield to truth and reason?—to gratify it, by exiling the poor blacks, or, to show its wickedness and resist it by all peaceable means? Look more clearly at the slaveholder. He can live with the black man as a *slave*, but not as an *equal neighbor*. If you transport *your* freed man, this prejudice of his is gratified, and the profit of his own slaves is augmented in proportion to the diminution of the supply of labor. Is there any tendency here to persuade him to emancipate? Is there as much as there would be, if, freeing and elevating your slaves on the soil, you should show him practically the foolishness of his prejudice and the unprofitableness of his oppression? And, again, can any sane man expect ever to remove slavery by carrying off those whom the masters may spontaneously liberate, while they are told by men of the highest character that their *rights* are held sacred, and that it is not their duty to emancipate any faster than it can be done with *safety* to themselves and their slaves? No, an appeal must be made to the consciences of slaveholders louder than seven thunders. The stern voice of eternal rectitude must be made to ring in their ears, till they are ashamed of their pretended *right of property* in human flesh, and till they *feel* slaveholding to be a sure introduction to disgrace, infamy, and deep damnation, whatsoever may happen to be the superficial tinge of their victims.

And what if the laws do stand opposed to emancipation on the soil? Is this any thing more than to say that the majority of slaveholders are now determined not to let the captive go free? Does it prove that they ought not to do so? Can human laws annul the laws of God? Where then is liberty of conscience? And what if the Federal Constitution upholds slavery? Is even that of Divine authority? Is it unalterable? If the framers of it had no right to guarantee the enslavement of the hundreds of thousands of slaves that then were, have we a right to continue the same iniquitous guarantee in regard to the millions that are in bondage now? If the Union of these States is not strong enough to bear rectifying in regard to

a vital point of JUSTICE, then it must be a Union to do wickedly :—the sooner it goes to pieces, the better. The blame will rest not upon the rectifiers but upon the wrong doers. What honor, I beg to be told, is done to the American Union by giving out that it would never have been formed if **ten eighteenth*s of the people had not pledged themselves to assist *five eighteenth*s in keeping the remaining *three eighteenth*s in the most abject bondage? or that it will be dissolved if 7,000,000 of northern free-men now withdraw this pledge from the 3,800,000 whites in the slaveholding States who have now in their grasp 2,000,000 of slaves? The plain fact is that a large majority of this nation has given up one part of the minority to the absolute control of the other part, and according to these profound sages of *expediency*, the wrong cannot be rectified without destroying the Union, and therefore ought not to be attempted. Patriots, how long do you expect the Union to last if the slavery question is left at rest? The immutable principles of *justice* are not to be given up because they endanger the existence of some human compact. The pillars of heaven are in safer keeping than ours, and we may be assured that if we will fearlessly speak the *truth*, all will be safe on earth that ought to be.

Do not be indifferent to slavery because it is said to be a political question. It is eminently a religious one, and cannot be safely neglected by any who would cultivate “pure religion and undefiled before God,” whatever may be the effect of its agitation upon the politics of the country. If it become a party question, the mischief will lie at the door of those who take the side of oppression. God, the Maker of both rich and poor, has a *party* in regard to slavery, and if that party be given up for the sake of peace with the wrong doers, it will hasten that righteous retribution which lies in store for this enormous sin.

Look at the conduct of Britain. Is the Christian public of Britain “mad,” “fanatical,” “frantic?” Or, is the voice which cries “break every yoke,” “let the oppressed go free,” the voice of mere JUSTICE? Shall it be said of Republican Christian America that she not only lacks the strong arm of power which might put down

* See the Census of 1790 and of 1830.

slavery with a dash of the pen, but that even her Christian people lack the disposition to say to the slaveholders that it is *their duty* to set every slave free now? What! shall the poor slave have to say, "Were these States British colonies I might now enjoy my "inalienable" rights, but because they are free and independent I must still groan a slave in sight of liberty?" Tell it not among the nations, that while king-trod Britain purges her territories from the foul sin, free America sides with the oppressors, and holds its victims with a firmer grasp!—There is no sincerity in our plea, that the Constitution prevents us from acting on this subject, while the District of Columbia remains as foul a slave mart as disgraces the Coast of Africa, and no voice is raised against it. Let us not be prevented by the combination of the tyrannous and the timid, from pleading for the poor and defenceless, and making *plain truth* the means of banishing from the earth the cruel and monstrous pretense of **PROPERTY IN MAN**.

The shallow arts of temporizers have been tried in all their changes, and tried long enough. The evil laughs at them, and would laugh them out of countenance but that just now the scourge of truth has scared it into a decent gravity. Let us have any thing, say the slaveholders, from the *pious Divines* down to the most profane of the laity, rather than this wild fanaticism of *immediate emancipation*. Why, rather than have this incendiary doctrine prevail, we will seriously admit that you may remove *slavery* by removing the *free*; that you may arouse conscience by letting it alone; that you may kill prejudice by feeding it; and that you may empty the ocean with a ladle! If we have not parted with every relic of sanity let us give these physical expedients to the winds; they make us contemptible in the sight of *both* worlds, and are not less cruel than ridiculous. While we are so sedulously engaged in winning the good graces of the slaveholders, and showing them how they may rid themselves of the unpleasant results of their iniquity without repenting of it, or abolishing any of their wicked laws against emancipation, the cry of abused **MILLIONS** is waxing louder. If, as I supposed just now, your own brother was in the hands of a cruel task master who was crushing body and soul together, and had been for years, while every

mild form of supplication had been tried in vain, would you still say, "Kind sir, I beseech you to liberate my brother, as soon as you can do it *safely*—if his presence should be disagreeable in this neighborhood, I will see that he is exiled to the other side of the Ocean,—I grant your *right*, Sir, but I appeal to your *generosity*?" Would you not rather, in a firm and erect position, utter an appeal to the conscience of the oppressor, so penetrating, that not to feel it would prove him a demon? Would you not spread the case before the moral sense of the world, to the eternal infamy of one, who, under the name of a *Christian man* could continue to hold in his felonious clutches your unoffending brother?

"But the slave-holders too are our brethren." Then let us deal faithfully with them. They have engrafted their own sin upon the abomination planted by their fathers. Shall we water the poisonous tree? Shall we extenuate their guilt by pleading that which really enhances its enormity? Shall we concede to them that it would be *unsafe* now to abolish property in *human flesh*? Shall we swim along in that malignant doctrine of *expediency* which can *magnify crime into righteousness*, white-wash rottenness and pollution, and clothe devils in the robes of Heaven? Because we too have wronged our brother in harboring against him a mean and cruel prejudice, shall we sit in silence while our neighbor does him a worse injury? No, *we* are the men whose "feet have well nigh slipped," and it becomes us to raise our loudest note of warning to those who are pressing on, encouraged by our past example, to the verge of a retribution so tremendous.

The turning of human beings into *property* has shrouded in darkness the light of TWO MILLIONS of minds, and on account of this, the slavery apologists plead for the slaveholders that they may hold their victims a little longer, till they are *elevated and prepared for freedom*! And this while the experience of all ages has proved that making property of men tends only and in all circumstances to degrade them. Just as if the right way to elevate men was not at once to take away the cause which has depressed them! Can a brotherly regard for infatuated oppressors require us to assent to such monstrous

absurdity, and ransack the tomes of Jesuitical casuistry to find other like apologies in their favor ?

The evil is approaching its crisis with fearful celerity. There is but one remedy, and it must be prescribed, cost what it will. It is the entire abandonment of the wicked pretense of *property in human beings*, and the yielding to every one his "inalienable" rights on the soil where he stands. To borrow all but one word of a forcible sentence : * "It were better that another deluge should overwhelm our land, leaving desolation from one end of it to the other, than to draw down on ourselves the wrath of the Most High, by continuing to counteract him in legally consigning over to littleness, inaction, and debasement, millions of minds which he made to expand and strengthen and rise to glory and honor and immortality."

God hath made of one blood *all nations* of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth.—*Apostle Paul*.

We hold these truths to be self-evident, that **ALL MEN ARE CREATED EQUAL** ; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights ; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.—*American Congress of 1776*.

These rights (natural rights) may be reduced to three primary articles, the right of personal security, the right of personal liberty, and the right of private property.

Judge Blackstone.

I tremble for my country when I reflect that God is just, and that his justice cannot sleep forever. The Almighty has no attribute which can take sides with us in this unrighteous work.—*Jefferson*.

Slavery "is not useful, either to the master or to the slave ; to the latter, because he can do nothing by virtue ; to the former, because he contracts with his slaves all sorts of evil habits, inures himself insensibly to neglect every moral virtue, and becomes proud, passionate, hard-hearted, violent, voluptuous, and cruel.—*Montesquieu*.

* See article on the Abuse of Mind in the American Quarterly Register.

Liberty and property form the basis of abundance and good agriculture. I never observed it flourish, where these rights of mankind were not firmly established. The earth which multiplies her productions with profusion under the hands of the free-born laborer, seems to shrink into barrenness, under the sweat of the slave.

Le Poivre.

If a man be found stealing any of his brethren—and maketh merchandize of him, or selleth him, the thief shall die.—*Bible.*

And he that stealeth a man and selleth him, or if he be found in his hands, he shall surely be put to death.—*Ib.*

Man to be possessed by man!—man to be made property of!—the image of the Deity to be put under the yoke! Let these usurpers show us their title deeds!

Simon Bolivar.

While I am indulging in my views of American prospects, and American liberty, it is mortifying to be told that in that very country *a large portion of the people are slaves!* It is a dark spot on the face of the nation. Such a state of things cannot always exist.—*Lafayette.*

Man is the property of man in about one half of the American States! Let them not therefore dare to prate of their institutions, of their national freedom, while they hold their fellow-man in bondage!

Daniel O'Connell.

Dr. Franklin's opinion was, that the effect of slavery was the luxury, imbecility, and diminution of the whites.

President Jefferson, though a slaveholder, gave it as his opinion, that the blacks will ultimately (in spite of all attempts to keep them ignorant) be the sole possessors of the low country, and the whites be obliged to migrate to other regions.

This pamphlet is printed on *linen paper*, as the publisher cannot conscientiously use paper made, wholly or in part, of *cotton rags*—the product of slave labor. If the friends of Abolition everywhere will practise “total abstinence” with respect to all slave-labor productions—articles of food—wearing apparel, &c. &c.—slavery will speedily come to an end. With reference to such articles I say then, “Touch not—taste not—handle not.”